DIRECT TESTIMONY

of

Joan Howard Consumer Policy Analyst

Consumer Services Division Illinois Commerce Commission

Reconciliation of revenues collected under Rider UF (Uncollectible Factors Rider) with uncollectible costs incurred

Commonwealth Edison Company

Docket No. 12-0505

March 1, 2013

1 Q. Please state your name and business address.

A. My name is Joan Howard. My business address is 527 East Capitol
Avenue, Springfield, Illinois 62701.

Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?

A. I am employed by the Illinois Commerce Commission ("Commission") as

a Consumer Policy Analyst in the Consumer Services Division. My

responsibilities include development of rules and policies pertaining to

consumer protection and consumer billing and payment practices; review

of utility policies and practices; review of tariff filings, assisting division

management in identifying and resolving consumer complaint trends; and

evaluation of data recorded in the Division's complaint tracking system.

A.

Q. What is the purpose of your testimony in this proceeding?

The purpose of my testimony is to report the results of my review of the prudence and reasonableness of the actions of Commonwealth Edison Company ("ComEd" or the "Company") to pursue minimization and collection of collectibles during the reconciliation period, June 1, 2011 through May 21, 2012, of Rider UF, Uncollectible Factors Rider ("Rider UF") and to make any recommended determinations for the Commission to make regarding adjustments to practices pursuant to the requirements of Section 16-111.8(c).

24 Q. Are you sponsoring any schedules as part of your direct testimony?

25 A. No.

A.

Q. What is the result of your review of the prudence and reasonableness of the Company's actions to pursue minimization and collection of collectibles during the period, June 1, 2011 through May 21, 2012, pursuant to Section 16-111.8(c) of the Act?

Upon reviewing the testimony of Company witness William B. DeLoach, concerning the Company's response to the Act's requirement that a utility with a tariff authorized by Section 16 -111.8(c) pursue minimization of and collection of uncollectibles through a list of six activities (ComEd Ex. 3.0, pp. 10-20), the Company's actions in this regard generally appear to be prudent and reasonable. In summary, as required by Section 16-111.8(c), ComEd's actions include (1) identifying customers with late payments; (2) contacting the customers in an effort to obtain payment; (3) providing delinquent customers with information about possible payment options; (4) serving disconnection notices; (5) implementing disconnections based on the level of uncollectibles; and (6) pursuing collection activities based on the level of uncollectibles.

- Q. Do you have recommended determinations for the Commission to make regarding adjustments to ComEd's implementation of practices required by Section 16-111.8(c)?
- A. I do not have any recommended determinations for the Commission to consider regarding the Company's minimization of uncollectibles and collection of uncollectibles.

Α.

Q. Do you have any other observations to make?

Yes, with regard to the description of ComEd's actions pertaining to serving disconnection notices, Mr. DeLoach does not address the Company's practice with respect to customers who are not eligible for disconnection of service during the winter heating season. Electric and gas public utilities are prohibited from disconnecting service to any residential customer who is a participant under Section 6 of the Energy Assistance Act of 1989 for nonpayment during the period from December 1 through and including March 31 of the immediately succeeding calendar year. Electric and gas public utilities are prohibited from disconnecting service to certain military personnel in military service. ComEd is prohibited from disconnecting service to a residential space-heating customer for non-payment from December 1 through March 31. It is my understanding that ComEd does not disconnect electric service to the above specified customers during times when disconnection is prohibited.

A final notice prior to disconnection of service sent to a customer who is not eligible for disconnection during the particular time covered by the notice would not be acted upon by the utility. However, I believe it is appropriate for the Company to issue other forms of notice of non-payment that do not warn of imminent disconnection of service during periods of time when the Company is prohibited from disconnecting service for nonpayment.

- 74 Q. Does this conclude your prepared direct testimony?
- 75 A. Yes, it does.